



Wiley Rein & Fielding LLP

1776 K STREET NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20006
PHONE 202.719.7000
FAX 202.719.7049

Virginia Office
7925 JONES BRANCH DRIVE
SUITE 6200
McLEAN, VA 22102
PHONE 703.905.2800
FAX 703.905.2820

www.wrf.com

August 4, 2005

Helgi C. Walker
202.719.7349
hwalker@wrf.com

Sam Feder
Acting General Counsel
Federal Communications Commission
445 12th Street SW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: Confidential Verizon Wireless Documents, WT Docket No. 05-193,
Petition For Declaratory Ruling Filed By SunCom: Clarification That
Early Termination Fees Are “Rates Charged” Within The Meaning of 47
U.S.C. Section 332(C)(3)(A).

Dear Mr. Feder:

On behalf of Verizon Wireless, this letter is to advise you that plaintiffs in a pending California state court litigation against Verizon Wireless and other wireless providers, *In re CellPhone Termination Fee Cases*, J.C.C.P. 4332 (Superior Court of California, County of Alameda), have successfully moved to modify the protective order previously adopted by the Court in that case to permit plaintiffs to file highly confidential Verizon Wireless documents—which were produced pursuant to mandatory discovery orders and covered by the protective order—before the Federal Communications Commission. While the plaintiffs’ request in the California proceeding was limited to any filings in the WT Docket No. 05-194, Petition For Declaratory Ruling Filed By CTIA Regarding Whether Early Termination Fees Are “Rates Charged” Within 47 U.S.C. Section 332(C)(3)(A), Verizon Wireless files this letter in the above-captioned proceeding out of an abundance of caution. The Court’s order modifying the protective order is attached hereto.

Verizon Wireless objected to the plaintiffs’ highly irregular request to use confidential documents produced to them by Verizon Wireless in separate litigation in an FCC proceeding and urged the Court to adopt strict procedural conditions to ensure that plaintiffs protect the confidentiality of the proprietary information at the Commission. The Court, on August 2, 2005, ruled that plaintiffs will be permitted to file certain proprietary Verizon Wireless documents and/or describe the details of such document before the FCC provided that they: (1) submit a cover letter as well as an appropriate motion and/or request asking that such documents be afforded confidential treatment; (2) stamp each page of such documents as confidential; and

Sam Feder
August 4, 2005
Page 2

(3) file any such documents in paper form, not electronically. The court also agreed to Verizon Wireless's request that plaintiffs identify the persons or entities that plaintiffs intend to include on any comments or other filings made before the FCC.

While the Court ordered plaintiffs to request confidential treatment, pursuant to 47 C.F.R. § 0.457(d)(2) & 47 C.F.R. § 0.459(b), for any documents covered by the prior protective order that they wish to file before the FCC, the Court placed the burden on Verizon Wireless to justify the basis for the confidential designation should such designation be questioned.

Even with the court-ordered procedures, Verizon Wireless is in the unfortunate position of having to justify the need for confidential treatment without knowing what information plaintiffs will include until such comments are filed.¹ Moreover, because the plaintiffs have no interest in keeping Verizon Wireless's proprietary information confidential, plaintiffs could seek to evade the Court's ruling by making arguments that rely upon—but not cite or file—proprietary documents.

To ensure that the procedures set forth in the Court's order are adhered to and that no Verizon Wireless proprietary information is disclosed publicly, Verizon Wireless respectfully requests that any comments or any other filings made by plaintiffs in WT Docket No. 05-193 initially be withheld from public inspection and set aside to permit Verizon Wireless to review such filing and determine if any arguments and/or attachments contain proprietary Verizon Wireless information. Withholding the plaintiffs' comments from public inspection is critical even if plaintiffs do not submit actual copies of any Verizon Wireless documents because, as noted above, plaintiffs may include arguments that rely in whole or in part on proprietary information. Once Verizon Wireless has conducted this review, and plaintiffs have submitted their request for protection as required by the Court's order, Verizon Wireless will take all further action as appropriate to ensure the confidentiality of its proprietary information and compliance with the procedures established by the Court's order.

¹ While plaintiffs identified a universe of possible proprietary and non-proprietary Verizon Wireless documents, Verizon Wireless has no idea whether the plaintiffs will in fact use any of the documents and, if so, whether the plaintiffs will submit copies of such documents or merely include arguments that are based upon the information contained in these documents.

Sam Feder
August 4, 2005
Page 3

As of the filing of this letter, plaintiffs' counsel have identified the following entities as comment-filers: American Association of Retired Persons ("AARP") (identified by the plaintiffs' law firm Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP); and Wireless Consumers Alliance, Inc., Delores (or "Dolores") Johnson, Richard Samko, Amanda Selby, Katherine Zill, Bruce Gatton, Porsha Meoli, Mark Lyons, Leslie Armstrong, Sridhar Krishnan, Margaret Schwarz, Astrid Mendoza, and Christina Nguyen (identified by plaintiffs' law firm Bramson, Plutzik, Mahler & Birkhaeuser LLP). While AARP and Wireless Consumer Alliance are *not* currently plaintiffs in the Alameda County litigation and thus are *not* authorized to file any confidential documents pursuant to the order, Verizon Wireless nonetheless requests that the Commission set these entities' comments aside to ensure that plaintiffs' counsel have not inappropriately or inadvertently included any Verizon Wireless proprietary information.²

Verizon Wireless emphasizes that it seeks only to protect its proprietary information produced pursuant to discovery requirements and protective order in a private litigation and does not seek to hinder plaintiffs' ability to file comments in the above-captioned proceeding. Thus, Verizon Wireless commits to identify any confidential information contained in plaintiffs' filings and to promptly take all necessary action to ensure confidential treatment thereof.

We appreciate your attention to this matter.

² . Although plaintiffs' counsel has represented to Verizon Wireless that no other plaintiff intends to file comments using Verizon Wireless confidential information, Verizon Wireless has no way of verifying this representation in advance. Verizon Wireless will communicate any further information from plaintiffs regarding additional comments or commenters as soon as it is received. For the information of the Commission, the named plaintiffs asserting claims against Verizon Wireless not identified above in the Alameda County proceedings are Molly White and Christine Morton. The lead law firms in the California action are Bramson, Plutzik, Mahler & Birkhaeuser LLP, Lerach Coughlin Stoia Geller Rudman & Robbins LLP, and Franklin & Franklin.

Sam Feder
August 4, 2005
Page 4

Sincerely yours,

/s/ Helgi C. Walker
Helgi C. Walker

cc: Matthew Berry, Acting Deputy General Counsel
Joel Kaufman, Deputy Associate General Counsel
Alan R. Plutzik, Counsel for plaintiffs
L. Timothy Fisher, Counsel for plaintiffs
Reed R. Kathrein, Counsel for plaintiffs
Jacqueline E. Mottek, Counsel for plaintiffs
Shana E. Scarlett, Counsel for plaintiffs
Aelish M. Baig, Counsel for plaintiffs
Jennie Lee Anderson, Counsel for plaintiffs
J. David Franklin, Counsel for plaintiffs
Kristin Linsley Myles, Counsel for Verizon Wireless



SUPERIOR COURT OF CALIFORNIA
COUNTY OF ALAMEDA

FILED
ALAMEDA COUNTY

AUG - 2 2005

CLERK OF THE SUPERIOR COURT
By Wesam Mengist Deputy

Case No.: C-835687

Coordination Proceeding
Special Title (Rule 1550(b))

CELLPHONE TERMINATION FEE CASES

**ORDER GRANTING PARTIAL RELIEF
FROM PROTECTIVE ORDER**

DATE: August 2, 2005
TIME: 9:00 am
DEPT: 22

The Plaintiffs' motion for partial relief from the protective order came on regularly for hearing on August 2, 2005, in Department 22, the Honorable Ronald M. Sabraw, presiding. Plaintiffs and Defendants appeared at the hearing through counsel of record.

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED.

Plaintiffs may submit to the FCC only those documents identified by subject and Bates number on pages 1 and 2 of Exhibit A of Plaintiff's Supplemental Appendix, together with Defendants' responses to contention interrogatories as well as deposition transcripts identified as exhibits E, F, G, and H of Plaintiffs' original Appendix in Support of Motion for Limited Relief from Protective Order.

All documents identified as "confidential" by Defendant in this action that Plaintiffs submit to the FCC and all comments that describe the details of confidential

documents must (1) be filed in paper form and not electronically; (2) be accompanied by a cover letter that substantially conforms to that included in Defendants' opposition; and (3) be stamped on each page with a legend substantially conforming to that included in Defendants' opposition.

Plaintiffs must also make the appropriate motions and/or requests at the FCC asking that the confidential documents be protected at the FCC.


The Court notes that at the FCC the Plaintiffs may be limited to stating that they are asking the FCC to treat the documents as confidential because in the California state court action the Defendants designated the documents as confidential. If the FCC requires a factual showing that any given document is truly confidential, then it may be appropriate to place that burden on the Defendant that originally designated the document as confidential.

The Court has considered Defendant Sprint's objections to the Plaintiffs' designation of certain documents after this Court's deadline. Despite the tardiness of that designation, the Court is inclined to permit the Plaintiffs broad latitude in submitting a record for the FCC's consideration. Sprint's objections are therefore overruled, and Plaintiffs' motion is GRANTED as to those additional documents, subject to the conditions described above.

The Court has returned to Plaintiffs all original documents submitted in support of this motion.

Dated

8/2/05


Judge of the Superior Court

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I certify that I am not a party to this cause and that I caused a true copy of the foregoing ORDER GRANTING PARTIAL RELIEF FROM PROTECTIVE ORDER to be mailed, first-class, postage pre-paid, in a sealed envelope, addressed as shown on the attached service list. Executed, deposited and mailed in Oakland, California on August 2, 2005.

Plaintiff's Liaison Counsel

Alan R. Plutzik, Esq.
BRAMSON, PLUTZIK, MAHLER & BIRKHAUSER, LLP
2125 Oak Grove Road, Suite 120
Walnut Creek, CA 94598

Defendant's Liaison Counsel

Kristen Linsley Myles, Esq.
John Hunt, Esq.
MUNGER, TOLLES & OLSON, LLP
560 Mission Street, 27th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94105-2907

Defendant's Liaison Counsel

Christopher Hockett, Esq.
Thomas S. Hixson, Esq.
BINGHAM McCUTCHEN, LLP
Three Embarcadero Center, Suite 1800
San Francisco, CA 94111

Wosen Mengiste
Wosen Mengiste, Deputy Clerk
Alameda County Superior Court, Department 22